

### **REMARKS**

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-22 were pending. Claims 1-5, 11-15, and 20-22 were rejected. Claims 5-10, 13 and 16-19 were objected to. In this paper, Claims 1, 4, 7-8, 11, 13, 15, and 17-18 are amended; Claims 6, 16, and 20-22 are cancelled. No Claims are added. Claims 1-5, 7-15, and 17-19 are currently pending. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 6-10 and 16-19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicant's representative has amended independent claim 1 to fully incorporate the allowable material from claim 6, and to further amend independent claim 11 to fully incorporate the allowable material of claim 16. Therefore, at least for the same reasons as claims 6 and 16 are allowable, amended independent claims 1 and 11 are now also allowable.

Moreover, because claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend from amended claim 1, and claims 12-15 and 17-19 depend from amended claim 11, each of these claims are now allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims from which they depend. Therefore, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that each of these claims be allowed to issue.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: inconsistent terminology. The limitation recites a "computing process," which was previously referred to as a "client process." In response, claim 13 has been amended to correct this informality, rendering the objection now moot.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 1-5, 11-15 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Intrusion detections using sequences of system cells", Hofmeyr, et al. (hereinafter Hofmeyr). While Applicant's representative disagrees that the cited prior art reference anticipates the mentioned claims, to expedite allowance, Applicant's representative has amended claims 1 and 11 with the above mentioned allowable material from claims 6 and 11, respectively, rendering such rejections now moot. Moreover, without conceding to the merits of the rejections, Applicant's representative has further canceled claims 20-22.


Therefore, Applicant's representative now respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable for at least the reasons cited above, and requests that the pending claims be allowed to issue.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Applicant's representative reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: May 21, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jamie L. Wiegand  
Registration No.: 52,361  
DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P.O. Box 770  
Church Street Station  
New York, New York 10008-0770  
(206\_ 262-8915  
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant